

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

03/27/2002

CLERK OF THE COURT
FORM L000

HONORABLE MICHAEL D. JONES

P. M. Espinoza
Deputy

LC 2001-000802

FILED: _____

STATE OF ARIZONA

EILEEN M MCGUIRE

v.

BRENDA W PLANTT

BRENDA W PLANTT
191 S SMOKE TREE AVE
LAKE HAVASU CITY AZ 86403-
0000

REMAND DESK CR-CCC
WICKENBURG TOWN COURT

MINUTE ENTRY

WICKENBURG CITY COURT

Cit. No. #036470

Charge: A. EXCESSIVE SPEED
B. SEATBELT NOT IN USE

DOB: 11/27/53

DOC: 08/09/01

This Court has jurisdiction of this appeal pursuant to the Arizona Constitution Article VI, Section 16, and A.R.S. Section 12-124(A).

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

03/27/2002

CLERK OF THE COURT
FORM L000

HONORABLE MICHAEL D. JONES

P. M. Espinoza
Deputy

LC 2001-000802

This matter has been under advisement and the Court has considered and reviewed the record of the proceedings from the trial Court, exhibits made of record and the Memoranda submitted.

The first issue raised by the Appellant concerns the sufficiency of the evidence to warrant the conviction and finding of responsibility. When reviewing the sufficiency of the evidence, an appellate court must not re-weigh the evidence to determine if it would reach the same conclusion as the original trier of fact.¹ All evidence will be viewed in a light most favorable to sustaining a conviction and all reasonable inferences will be resolved against the Defendant.² If conflicts in evidence exists, the appellate court must resolve such conflicts in favor of sustaining the verdict and against the Defendant.³ An appellate court shall afford great weight to the trial court's assessment of witnesses' credibility and should not reverse the trial court's weighing of evidence absent clear error.⁴ When the sufficiency of evidence to support a judgment is questioned on appeal, an appellate court will examine the record only to determine whether substantial evidence exists to support the action of the lower court.⁵ The Arizona Supreme Court has explained in State v. Tison⁶ that "substantial evidence" means:

¹ State v. Guerra, 161 Ariz. 289, 778 P.2d 1185 (1989); State v. Mincey, 141 Ariz. 425, 687 P.2d 1180, cert.denied, 469 U.S. 1040, 105 S.Ct. 521, 83 L.Ed.2d 409 (1984); State v. Brown, 125 Ariz. 160, 608 P.2d 299 (1980); Hollis v. Industrial Commission, 94 Ariz. 113, 382 P.2d 226 (1963).

² State v. Guerra, supra; State v. Tison, 129 Ariz. 546, 633 P.2d 355 (1981), cert.denied, 459 U.S. 882, 103 S.Ct. 180, 74 L.Ed.2d 147 (1982).

³ State v. Guerra, supra; State v. Girdler, 138 Ariz. 482, 675 P.2d 1301 (1983), cert.denied, 467 U.S. 1244, 104 S.Ct. 3519, 82 L.Ed.2d 826 (1984).

⁴ In re: Estate of Shumway, 197 Ariz. 57, 3 P.3rd 977, review granted in part, opinion vacated in part 9 P.3rd 1062; Ryder v. Leach, 3 Ariz. 129, 77P. 490 (1889).

⁵ Hutcherson v. City of Phoenix, 192 Ariz. 51, 961 P.2d 449 (1998); State v. Guerra, supra; State ex rel. Herman v. Schaffer, 110 Ariz. 91, 515 P.2d 593 (1973).

⁶ SUPRA.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

03/27/2002

CLERK OF THE COURT
FORM L000

HONORABLE MICHAEL D. JONES

P. M. Espinoza
Deputy

LC 2001-000802

More than a scintilla and is such proof as a reasonable mind would employ to support the conclusion reached. It is of a character which would convince an unprejudiced thinking mind of the truth of the fact to which the evidence is directed. If reasonable men may fairly differ as to whether certain evidence establishes a fact in issue, then such evidence must be considered as substantial.⁷

This Court finds that the trial court's determination was not clearly erroneous and was supported by substantial evidence.

Secondly, Appellant contends that the trial judge did not allow her to cross-examine the State's witness. Appellant contends that the trial judge interrupted her; however, the record reflects that the interruption was an objection by counsel for Appellee. Counsel have a right, and a duty, to interrupt with objections where appropriate. The record does reflect that Appellant was allowed to fully cross-examine the State's officer without limitation or interruptions by the trial court. The trial court did interrupt Appellant at one point to caution her about interrupting him. Overall, the trial judge displayed a great deal of patience in dealing with Appellant who frequently interrupted the State's witness and the trial judge. This Court finds no error.

IT IS ORDERED affirming the judgment of guilt and sentences imposed.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED remanding this matter back to the Wickenburg City Court for all further and future proceedings in this case.

⁷ Id. At 553, 633 P.2d at 362.
Docket Code 512